

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are submitted responsive to the Office Action dated November 2, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed before the expiration of the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,818,920 to Rignell, *et al.* (hereinafter Rignell), in view of U.S. Patent 6,574,486 to Labban (hereinafter Labban), and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,934,543 to Wang, *et al.* (hereinafter Wang). Claim 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rignell, in view of Wang. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rignell, in view of Wang, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,075,992 to Moon, *et al.* (hereinafter Moon).

#### **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, Claim 16 was objected to for failing to properly show the correct markup for the claim. In response to this claim objection, a corrected version of the previously-submitted Claim 16 is provided on page 2. However, the version on page 2 is not intended to be the final version of this claim, but is only provided for reference and completeness.

Claim 16 was also objected to for several typographical and reference errors. In this response, Applicants have endeavored to correct such errors and provide a fully corrected and complete version of Claim 16 for examination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

**Amendments to the Claims**

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections in the Office Action, Applicants nonetheless have amended the claims in order to expedite prosecution of the present application by further emphasizing certain aspects of the claims. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that the claim amendments presented are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Applicants are not conceding by these amendments that any previously submitted claims are unpatentable over the references of record. Applicants' present claim amendments are submitted only for purposes of facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue any previously submitted claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

In this response, Applicants have amended the independent claims to emphasize certain aspects of the claims. In particular, the independent claims have been amended to essentially include the limitations of Claim 21. Such an amendment is fully supported throughout the Specification. Claim 21 and 22 have also been cancelled in this response. No new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.

**The Claims Define Over the Cited References**

In the Office Action, Claim 21 was rejected as being unpatentable over Rignell in view of Labban and Wang. In the rejection, the Office Action acknowledges that Rignell fails to disclose the step of prompting a sending or calling party as to whether to display the current location information of the receiving party. However, the rejection in the Office Action asserts that the step of prompting the sending or calling party to display such information is well known in the art. In support of its assertion, the Office Action cites Wang as disclosing such information. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Wang fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious the step of querying the sending or calling party as to whether the party wishes to view current local information for the receiving or called party. In the cited portion of Wang (Col. 8, lines 17-22), Wang only discloses that at the times specified by the called or received party, the call will be blocked. In response, Wang discloses that the calling party will be informed that the call is blocked and provided the opportunity to leave a message or override the block. However, nowhere does Wang disclose or suggest providing the calling party with any explanation of *why* the call was blocked (i.e., the local information leading to the block), regardless of any action or inaction of the calling party. Furthermore, even if such a limitation were disclosed in Wang, Wang also fails to disclose or suggest querying the calling party as to whether the party would like to view the current local information. In other words, Wang only discloses the blocking of calls and prompting the calling party to leave a message or override the block. Nowhere does Wang disclose or suggest that any action of calling party can result in providing local information to the calling party. In fact, Wang explicitly discloses that local information can be provided to the calling party only if the called party approves providing such information to the calling party (see, e.g., Col. 8, lines 29-32). As such, Applicants respectfully submit that although alerting a calling party to the fact that the call cannot be completed or that a text or voice message has been received that might include local information may be obvious in view of the references of record, querying a calling party *directly* as to whether they wish to view current local information would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In contrast, the claims, as amended, explicitly recite the limitation that responsive to receiving the called party's local information, the calling party can be queried as to whether the party wishes to display the current local information. Such a configuration can be advantageous as it simplifies the process for a calling party to determine the reason for a blocked called. For example, rather than requiring the calling party to search

through text messages or voice messages that might contain the local information, the calling party can directly access the information by responding in positive to the query.

Accordingly, Rignell, Labban, and Wang, separately or in combination with each other or any other reference of record, fail to disclose, suggest, or render obvious each and every element of the independent claims, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the independent claims define over the references of record. Furthermore, as the remaining claims each depend from one of the independent claims while reciting additional references, Applicants submit that the dependent claims likewise define over the references of record.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Date: **January 2, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard A. Hinson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652

Eduardo Quinones, Registration No. 58,575

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-5000